

mtt.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/941,251	08/28/2001	Dwip N. Banerjee	AUS920010507US1	5907

7590

03/01/2004

Duke W. Yee
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP
P.O. Box 802334
Dallas, TX 75380

EXAMINER

HARRIS, CHANDA L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3714

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/941,251	Applicant(s) BANERJEE ET AL.	
	Examiner Chanda L. Harris	Art Unit 3714	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Chanda L. Harris. (3) _____

(2) Stephen J. Walder, Jr. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 27 February 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: Greene et al. (US 2002/0172931), Turner et al. (US 6,633,742), Remschel (US 6,208,832).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Attorney discussed that Turner does not teach "individual test questions" as is claimed in claim 1 and that Greene does not teach "determining an elapsed time used by the remotely located user in attempting to answer a test question." No agreement has been reached. Attorney will respond in due course to the last office action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Chanda L. Harris
Examiner's signature, if required

**Carstens,
Yee &
Cahoon, L.L.P.**

13760 Noel Road
Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75240

Main No. (972) 367-2001
Facsimile (972) 367-2002

Facsimile Cover Sheet

To: Commissioner for Patents for Examiner Chandra Harris Group Art Unit 2132	Facsimile No.: 703/746-3234
From: Carrie Parker Legal Assistant to Vicky Ash and Stephen J. Walder, Jr.	No. of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 11
Message: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faxing per your request an Agenda and proposed claims for conference call today at 2:30 p.m.	
Re: Application No. 09/941,251 Attorney Docket No: AUS920010507US1	
Date: Wednesday, February 25, 2004	
Please contact us at (972) 367-2001 if you do not receive all pages indicated above or experience any difficulty in receiving this facsimile.	<i>This Facsimile is intended only for the use of the addressee and, if the addressee is a client or their agent, contains privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this facsimile, you have received this facsimile inadvertently and in error. Any review, dissemination, distribution, or copying is strictly prohibited. If you received this facsimile in error, please notify us by telephone and return the facsimile to us immediately.</i>

**PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS TRANSMISSION
BY FAXING A CONFIRMATION TO 972-367-2002.**

AGENDA

TO: Examiner Chandra Harris

FROM: Stephen J. Walder, Jr.
Vicky Ash

RE: 09/941,251

INTERVIEW: Wednesday, February 25, 2004 at 2:30 p.m. eastern time

+++++

- (1) Discuss patentability of Claims 6, 29, and 46 over Greene.
- (2) Discuss patentability of Claims 1, 23, 28, and 47 over Renschel in view of Turner.

Please do not hesitate to contact Vicky Ash or myself (Carrie Parker) if you have any questions. Our telephone number is 972-367-2001.

Thank you.

IN THE CLAIMS:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for monitoring responses to test questions presented in a data processing system, the method comprising the computer implemented steps of:

identifying presentation of the test questions on the data processing system;
responsive to the presentation of the test questions on the data processing system, monitoring test question timing data in which the test question timing data represents an elapsed time since an answered question from the test questions has been presented; and
generating an alert after the test question timing data exceeds a threshold, wherein the alert apprises the test taker that the elapsed time is excessive for a test question.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the monitoring step is performed by a proctor device or a program on the data processing system.

3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein the program is an applet.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1 further comprising:
billing a client for monitoring the presentation of the test questions.

5. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the test questions are part of a test and further comprising:

storing an identification of a number of test takers for the test; and
billing a client based on the number of test takers for the test.

6. (Currently Amended) A method of monitoring a test question response time, comprising the steps of:

administering a test to a remotely located user of a client device;
receiving test question timing data from the client device, the test question timing data representing an elapsed time used by the remotely located user in attempting to answer the a test question; and

outputting the test question timing data to a proctor device such that the proctor device may monitor the elapsed time in attempting to answer the test question for the remotely located user.

7. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising billing a test developer for administration of the test to the remotely located user.
8. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising billing the remotely located user for administration of the test.
9. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising sending an instant message to the client device.
10. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising receiving an instant message from the client device.
11. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising alerting the remotely located user when the test question timing data exceeds a predetermined threshold.
12. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising storing a score for the test in a permanent storage.
13. (Original) The method of claim 6, wherein the test is developed by a test developer and wherein the method is implemented by a test administration system that is operated by a different entity from the test developer.
14. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising:
 - receiving a request for administration of the test to the remotely located user;
 - establishing a session identification for the administration of the test to the remotely located user; and

correlating the test question timing data to the administration of the test to the remotely located user based on the session identification.

15. (Original) The method of claim 14, wherein the session identification includes a proctor device identifier, and wherein outputting the test question timing data to the proctor device is based on the proctor device identifier.

16. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising:
storing an indicator of a number of test takers for the test; and
billing a test developer of the test based on the number of test takers for the test.

17. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising:
monitoring the test question timing data for evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question, wherein outputting the test question timing data to a proctor device is performed in response to determining that evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question is present.

18. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 17, wherein monitoring the test question timing data for evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question includes comparing previously received test question timing data to currently received test question timing data to determine if a change in the test question timing data indicates evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question.

19. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising generating an alert profile for the remotely located user for a particular test based on at least one of a data profile associated with the remotely located user, an examination question timing database, and a degree of difficulty associated with a question on the test.

20. (Original) The method of claim 19, further comprising transmitting an alert to the remotely located user based on the generated alert profile.

21. (Original) The method of claim 19, further comprising storing a response from the remotely located user to update the alert profile for use in future tests.

22. (Original) The method of claim 6, further comprising storing of the timing data for the test question to update timing data for the remotely located user for use in future tests.

23. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for monitoring responses to test questions presented in a data processing system, the apparatus comprising:

identifying means for identifying presentation of the test questions on the data processing system;

monitoring means, responsive to the presentation of the test questions on the data processing system, for monitoring test question timing data in which the test question timing data represents an elapsed time since an answered question from the test questions has been presented; and

generating means for generating an alert after the test question timing data exceeds a threshold, wherein the alert apprises the test taker that the elapsed time is excessive for a test question.

24. (Original) The apparatus of claim 23, wherein the apparatus is a proctor device or a program on the data processing system.

25. (Original) The apparatus of claim 24, wherein the program is an applet.

26. (Original) The apparatus of claim 23 further comprising:

billing means for billing a client for monitoring the presentation of the test questions.

27. (Original) The apparatus of claim 23, wherein the test questions are part of a test and further comprising:

storing means for storing an identification of a number of test takers for the test;
and

billing means for billing a client based on the number of test takers for the test.

28. (Currently Amended) A data processing system comprising:

a bus system;

a communications unit connected to the bus system;

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions; and

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to identify presentation of the test questions on the a data processing system, monitor test question timing data in response to the presentation of the test questions on the data processing system in which the test question timing data represents an elapsed time since an answered question from the test questions has been presented, and generate an alert after the test question timing data exceeds a threshold, wherein the alert apprises the test taker that the elapsed time is excessive for a test question.

29. (Currently Amended) An apparatus for monitoring a test question response time, comprising:

a controller; and

at least one interface coupled to the controller, wherein the controller administers a test to a remotely located user of a client device via the at least one interface, receives test question timing data from the client device via the at least one interface, the test question timing data representing an elapsed time used by the remotely located user in attempting to answer the a test question, and outputs the test question timing data to a proctor device via the at least one interface, such that the proctor device may monitor the elapsed time in attempting to answer the test question for the remotely located user.

30. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller bills a test developer for administration of the test to the remotely located user.

31. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller bills the remotely located user for administration of the test.
32. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller sends an instant message to the client device via the at least one interface.
33. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller receives an instant message from the client device via the at least one interface.
34. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller alerts the remotely located user when the test question timing data exceeds a predetermined threshold.
35. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, further comprising a storage device, wherein the controller stores a score for the test in the storage device.
36. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the test is developed by a test developer and wherein the apparatus is operated by a different entity from the test developer.
37. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller receives a request for administration of the test to the remotely located user, establishes a session identification for the administration of the test to the remotely located user, and correlates the test question timing data to the administration of the test to the remotely located user based on the session identification.
38. (Original) The apparatus of claim 37, wherein the session identification includes a proctor device identifier, and wherein the controller outputs the test question timing data to the proctor device based on the proctor device identifier.
39. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, further comprising a storage device, wherein the controller stores an indicator of a number of test takers for the test in the

storage device and bills a test developer of the test based on the number of test takers for the test.

40. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, wherein the controller monitors the test environment data for evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question, and wherein the controller outputs the test question timing data to a proctor device in response to determining that evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question is present.

41. (Original) The apparatus of claim 40, wherein the controller monitors the test question timing data for evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question by comparing previously received test question timing data to currently received test environment data to determine if a change in the test question timing data indicates evidence of greater than expected response time to the test question.

42. (Original) The apparatus of claim 29, further comprising generating an alert profile for the remotely located user for a particular test based on at least one of a data profile associated with the remotely located user, an examination question timing database, and a degree of difficulty associated with a question on the test.

43. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 42, further comprising transmitting an alert to the remotely located user based on the generated alert profile.

44. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 42, further comprising storing a response from the remotely located user to update the alert profile for future tests.

45. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29, further comprising storing of the timing data for the test question to update timing data for the remotely located user for future tests.

46. (Currently Amended) A computer program product in a computer readable medium for monitoring a test question response time, comprising:

first instructions for administering a test to a remotely located user of a client device;

second instructions for receiving test question timing data from the client device, the test question timing data representing an elapsed time used by the remotely located user in attempting to answer ~~the~~ a test question; and

third instructions for outputting the test question timing data to a proctor device such that the proctor device may monitor the elapsed time in attempting to answer the test question for the remotely located user.

47. (Currently Amended) A computer program product in a computer readable medium for use in monitoring responses to test questions presented in a data processing system, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for identifying presentation of the test questions on the data processing system;

second instructions, responsive to the presentation of the test questions on the data processing system, for monitoring test question timing data in which the test question timing data represents an elapsed time since an answered question from the test questions has been presented; and

third instructions for generating an alert after the test question timing data exceeds a threshold, wherein the alert apprises the test taker that the elapsed time is excessive for a test question.

48. (Original) The computer program product of claim 47, wherein the second instructions are located in a proctor device or a program on the data processing system.

49. (Original) The computer program product of claim 47 further comprising:

fourth instructions for billing a client for monitoring the presentation of the test questions.

50. (Original) The computer program product of claim 47, wherein the test questions are part of a test and further comprising:

fourth instructions for storing an identification of a number of test takers for the test; and

fifth instructions for billing a client based on the number of test takers for the test.